vss

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.5861 OF 2005

Kuberbhai Becharbhai Bhutiya ... Petitioner

V/s.

Trambakrao Shripatrao Jadhav & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr.M.R. Deshpande for Petitioner
Mr.N.V. Walawalkar for Respondent

CORAM: **SMT.NISHITA MHATRE, J.**

DATED: **SEPTEMBER 20, 2005**

P.C.:

. The Petitioner challenges the order of the appellate Court which has decreed the suit against the Respondents. The appellate Court has held that the suit premises are bonafide and reasonably required by the landlord, i.e., the Respondent herein. The contention of the Petitioner that the landlord had acquired certain other premises which would take care of the need of the landlord has been negatived by the appellate Court. The appellate Court has found that those premises are used for a grinding mill and that the suit premises are required by the landlord for the members of his family.

2. The appellate Court has also observed that the Petitioner had acquired alternate accommodation at

Jamkhandi in Vijapur. The Petitioner has not in any manner established that those premises were not suitable and therefore the appellate Court has decreed the suit under sections 13(1)(g) and 13(1)(k) of the Bombay Rent Act.

3. In view of this, I see no infirmity in the order of the appellate Court. Petition rejected.